Interview Summary

Application No. Applicant(s)

09/402,721

Pelz et al.

Examiner

Curtis E. Sherrer

Art Unit 1761

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):
(1) Curtis E. Sherrer	(3)
(2) Jeremy M. Jay	(4)
Date of Interview Feb 4, 2003	
Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant	2) X applicant's representative]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes	e) 🛮 No. If yes, brief description:
Claim(s) discussed: All claims in general, specifically, claims 1, 2, 4, 29, 31 and 36. Identification of prior art discussed: Fuji, Ebara, Applicants' admissions and Le Bolay.	
any other comments: Applicants will consider submitting arguments after final d may include that those of ordinary skill would not look to	lirected to the shortcomings of the prior art. The arguments the cited art for beer filter cleaning processes; that the e cellulase (claim2); and that the prior art does not recognize the
allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no available, a summary thereof must be attached.) i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separation of the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORM INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See Miller already been filed. APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FR	ndments which the examiner agreed would render the claims copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is arate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). MAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST PEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has ROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE ord of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

CURTIS E. SHERRER PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 1761

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.